DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 132 HE 000 692

By-Bowen, Howard R.

A New Era for Higher Education.

American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 4 Mar 69
Note-10p.; Paper presented to the 2nd General Session of the 24th National Conference on Higher Education, March 4, 1969, Chicago, Illinois
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.60
Descriptors-Educational Change, *Governance, Governing Boards, *Higher Education, *Liberal Arts, *Participation, Power Structure, *Undergraduate Study

The greatest weakness of US liberal education is that students are not encouraged to learn outside the rigidly structured system of courses, credits, grades, and frequent tests. Some criticisms of liberal education concern professors who are more devoted to their disciplines than to their students, and the lack of diversification of curricula for students of differing talents and temperments. Educational methods emphasize formal quantitative standards which direct students' motivation toward meeting the requirements and away from genuine learning. On the matter of university governance, 5 internal groups are competing for influence and power: the governing board, the administration, faculty, students, and non-academic staff. The last 3 groups are clamoring for increasing authority in decision making. One possible solution would be to have each group, except the governing board, represented on an advisory council which would submit its decisions to the governing board for review. In this way the various groups in the university would function through discussion and persuasion, not coercion, and final authority would still rest with the president of the university. There are important values in the present system of governance, but it should be an instrument of educational reform. Faculty members and administrators should adapt liberal education to the twentieth century in order to promote a better education for today's undergraduates. (WM)

ED031132

(2) (3)

2nd General Session
Tuesday morning, March 4

A NEW ERA FOR HIGHER EDUCATION*

Howard R. Bowen
President
University of Iowa

The post-war era for higher education has been one of spectacular accomplishment. In enrollment, finance, staffing, faculty compensation, building, student aid, and research our expectations--even our most extravagant dreams--have been exceeded.

But there is one aspect of academic life that has not changed very much. That is the liberal education of undergraduates. While much lip service is given to innovation, new technology, and the like, most teaching still centers around the professor, the textbook, didactic lectures, close supervision of the student, credits, and grades. Whatever gain has been made in effectiveness of instruction has occurred through improved motivation of students, better secondary preparation, and improved qualifications of faculty--not through improvement in the mode of instruction in colleges and universities. Also it is doubtful if efficiency of instruction has improved in the sense of lowering cost per student. It is remarkable that in a period of revolutionary change in the scope and resources for higher education, there has been so little change in forms of instruction. Either we had long ago discovered the optimal methods, and no significant improvement is possible, or faculties are incorrigibly conservative. Take your choice.

We have now reached a kind of pause in the post-war boom in higher education. Enrollments will doubtless continue to rise but at a slower rate than in the past decade. A slow-down in the expansion of financial resources is now occurring and the outlook for the future is uncertain. And the political climate in which education is operating today is for obvious reasons less favorable than it was a decade ago.

The present pause in the advancement of higher education is of course a time for stock-taking and planning. I should like to discuss the future with reference to two closely related topics: undergraduate liberal education and the governance of institutions.

1. A Critique of Liberal Education

Undergraduate liberal education is the area, I believe, that needs our devoted attention in the years ahead. I am particularly concerned about the state of liberal education in the complex universities, though we all know it is not exactly thriving in many independent colleges either.

Let me mention some of the many trenchant criticisms of liberal education today. While I do not agree with all the complaints, yet I find some truth in most of them.

One set of criticisms concerns the teaching staff available for undergraduate

---

*Remarks presented at 2nd General Session of the 24th National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Tuesday morning, March 4. Permission to quote restricted.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 000 692

instruction in the arts and sciences. Most faculty members are highly specialized professionals who are strongly oriented toward their disciplines. Many are interested primarily in the teaching of their subjects and few give much attention to the broad intellectual and moral growth of students as persons. The university, though it gives lip service to undergraduate teaching, actually gives much higher priority to professional and public recognition of its faculty through research, scholarship, and public service. The influence of the professional "guilds," reinforces this bias. Moreover, the faculty, which both makes and implements educational policy, blocks genuine reforms.

Another set of criticisms concerns the intellectual content and curricula of liberal education. It is said that the curriculum, despite the rhetoric in the catalogs, is overwhelmingly professional or pre-professional in its emphasis. Even the general education movement that became popular after World War II appears to have about petered out, The goal of most courses and curricula is to convey disciplines, rather than to develop students as persons. The curriculum has little impact on the life, values, goals, feelings, and deeds of the student. It fails to come to grips with the universal problems of human life and with the great issues of our time which do not fall neatly into disciplines. It often seems to the student sterile and irrelevant, and fails to motivate him or even repels him. Even the humanities and social studies have become technical and pseudoscientific fields to the near exclusion of the great moral and policy issues. The curriculum is spiritually impoverished when young people are grasping for meanings and when colleges and universities are the principal centers surviving in our society for moral and spiritual inquiry. Also the curriculum, built up of randomly selected smatterings, lacks integration.

The essential form of the curriculum tends to be standardized for all students--not only in any one institution but also throughout the nation. Except for certain honors programs and selective sectioning of courses, involving only a few students and a handful of experimental colleges, the possibility of diversification for students of differing talents and temperaments is woefully limited. Aside from the rigidity involved, the single track inhibits fruitful experimentation. Finally, such curricular reform as takes place involves mere shuffling of courses, requirements, and prerequisites. It is carried on in a psychological vacuum because it does not consider students, their motives, aspirations, mode of learning, personality, and character development.

Next, let me recite the criticisms of educational methods. Present methods are mechanical. They rely excessively on course requirements, prerequisites, so-called "objective" tests, grades, credits, residence, and the like. The emphasis on such formal quantitative standards directs motivation toward meeting the requirements and away from genuine learning. More important, the student is not given enough responsibility for his own education. He is given detailed assignments in textbooks, lectured to, and checked on by frequent quizzes--in other words, he is literally led by the hand and given little incentive to discover how to learn by himself. One might call it "Do-as-you-are-told" system of education. Opportunities for self-expression in written and oral form are few. The competitiveness of the present system defeats efforts of individual professors to encourage independent study or learning for its own sake outside the conventional pattern, because the "system" preempts available time. Finally, colleges and universities have been overly conservative in the use of modern technology for the more routine aspects of education.

Another criticism pertains to administrative organization. The university is organized so that no one has clear and undivided administrative responsibility for undergraduate liberal education. The College of Arts and Sciences is usually a federation of departments, each of which is occupied with the advancement of a discipline not with the liberal education of undergraduates. The dean is almost inevitably committed to the advancement of departments rather than to the education and growth of young people. In any case, his range of administrative duty is so broad that he has little chance to give strong leadership in undergraduate liberal education. Counseling functions are divided among many specialized agencies. Indeed, no one in the university is directly responsible for the growth in intellect and character of individual students as persons. There is no official or organization responsible for the promotion of liberal education for undergraduates comparable to the graduate college which is clearly and directly responsible for the promotion of graduate education and research.

Another set of criticism concerns extracurricular life. The relationship between the curriculum and the student's out-of-class activity is detached. Most universities ignore or greatly underrate the possibilities of learning through work-study programs, political activity, volunteer work, field experiences, travel, and other out-of-class activities. Students are not adequately involved in planning their own education, individually or collectively.

Finally, the university is criticized for its posture vis-a-vis society. The university's involvement with the established order as a trainer of professionals and a research and service agency, robs it of its role as disinterested critic of society and thereby reduces its capacity for liberal education.

So much for the criticisms. Whether or not one agrees with them all, together they are an impressive indictment. Every experienced educator has heard most of these criticisms. The urgency arises from the cumulation of many complaints. It also arises from fundamental changes occurring in the temper or spirit of our society. Among these changes are the widespread concern about the pressing social problems of war, race, poverty, pollution, etc.; the determined drive of many groups in our society (including the young) for greater freedoms and rights and for participation in decisions affecting them; the rise of philosophies alien to the rational and scientific approach to knowledge and to life; the increased yearning for reliable values relevant to life in an affluent, automated economy. These changes add up to a clear demand for liberal education in the traditional sense of that term; they also call unmistakably for reform of the content and method of that education as it has been practiced for the past fifty years. The price of failing to correct past deficiencies and to adapt to new needs and conditions will be apathy, rebellion, or both on the part of students, frustration on the part of faculty, and failure to serve society in our primary function which is education.

It is easy to criticize. It is more difficult, as we all know, to find workable solutions. The first step is willingness to change, something I submit most of us have not been eager to do, especially since we can properly claim that American higher education as it now exists is in many ways a considerable success.

2. Proposals for Reform of Liberal Education

I shall mention, however, some specific measures that are clearly needed. We talk repeatedly about most of these ideas, but somehow *there* is much slippage between intentions and actions.

In our graduate schools, we should pay more attention to preparing future college teachers, and--along the same line--should improve the training and motivation of teaching assistants. We should also give greater recognition, in the rewards of faculty members, to teaching and educational innovation. One aspect of the problem is that our motivational system is askew. Professional recognition through research and scholarship has become the primary goal of both professors and institutions. Professional prestige is the motive force of a university. Prestige for a university corresponds to profit for a corporation as the main goal. The vanity of the academic world is hardly surpassed by that of any other field of endeavor with the possible exceptions of show business and politics. I believe our students are the victims of this vanity.

The curriculum needs to be modified to give less emphasis to conventional disciplines and more attention to great intellectual and moral issues. Less attention to text books and more attention to great books is in order. There should be less lecturing, fewer class meetings, and increasing emphasis on writing and oral expression, on discussion, and on out-of-classroom experience. The number of different courses students take should be reduced. The concern of educators should be the growth of young men and women as emotional and moral as well as intellectual persons, and the curriculum should be nudged toward less emphasis on the scientific-rational and more on the poetic-metaphoric-intuitive-artistic with increasing concern for values.

Students should be given greater responsibility for their learning. The rigid "do-as-you-are-told" system, characterized by the course-grade-credit-prerequisite syndrome, should give way to opportunities for students to follow their interest and curiosity, and to assume increasing responsibility for their own learning.

I have long thought that the greatest weakness of American liberal education is that students are not encouraged to learn outside the rigidly supervised and structured system of courses, credits, grades, and frequent tests. We do our students a great disservice in not helping them to become self-directed learners. Our present system is designed as though passive achievement under close supervision, doing as you are told, were the major goal. We should devise a system that makes independent learning the highest goal. Even if independence were not possible for all students (and I do not accept this premise) we should be able to have different tracks which would permit greater independence for many. One device for introducing different tracks would be the cluster college.

Perhaps more important than specific recommendations is the general suggestion that higher education should be more exploratory and experimental in its approach to undergraduate education. The critics say that American higher education stands indicted not only for its failure to meet the urgent educational needs of its students and of society but also is guilty of not even actively trying to discover ways of improving the situation. In this connection, many harsh things are said about the conservatism of faculty.

A recent study of curricular innovation by Paul L. Dressel and Frances H. DeLisle of Michigan State University notes many scattered changes but concludes that "Much of what passes for innovation is but the hasty adoption of fads. . . . Such innovations . . . do not reflect any changes in the basic philosophy, objectives, or assumptions of the institution. . . . the actual educational experience of the student may not be significantly altered. Faculty interests, publicity, institutional prestige, opportunism . . . are more potent determiners of specific change

than is deliberation based on educational goals, social needs, and the abilities and aspirations of students." These authors refer to "general absence of perspective . . . with reference to the liberal arts experience as a whole."[1]

The critics of modern education must face the argument that the vast increases in numbers of students to be educated, and the wide range of student abilities involved, raise grave questions about the feasibility of improvement. Most suggestions turn out to be too costly in money and manpower for general application. My opinion, however, is that better education is consistent with lower cost precisely because present methods are based on close supervision which is costly and fails to encourage students to learn to take responsibility for their own education. We insist on lecturing when the written word or the film would do as well; we continue to provide detailed supervision when students should be motivated to become self-directed learners; and we ignore opportunities for students to learn from each other. We have believed that educational improvement could be achieved only by increasing the application of resources and thereby increasing the dependency of our students. The time has come, for both educational and financial reasons, to recognize that the need to economize on resources will enable us, perhaps force us, to raise up a generation of independent learners. Our goals should be to discover ways to educational improvement through using fewer resources rather than through greater application of manpower and money. This is a mode of thought utterly alien to most educators.

The part of the problem I have never been able to solve is how to enlist faculty interest in the reform of liberal education. Will it take student riots? Will it take massive cuts in appropriations or other financial support? Will it require a new system of motivation which increases the status of educational innovation as compared with research? Will it require a financial incentive system which will give to faculty members a cut of any savings through improved efficiency? I know it is going to take something more drastic than anything I have had the temerity to apply in my twenty years of academic administration.

3. Governance

I turn now to the governance of institutions of higher education, to the question of how should influence and power be distributed among the many groups who are only too eager to take part in directing the affairs of colleges and universities. I believe this question is related to the matter of educational reform. In identifying the groups who wield influence, one may distinguish between those which are external to the institution and those which are internal. Among the external groups are legislative bodies, state administrative officials, Federal grant-awarding agencies, state coordinating boards, accrediting bodies, athletic conferences, foundations, other private donors, and alumni. The chief internal groups are the governing board, the president and the administrative staff, the faculty, the students, and the non-academic staff.

The influence or power of the external groups and agencies affects the autonomy or independence of the university. The influence or power of the internal groups affects the decision-making process for matters outsiders have left to the discretion of the institution.

In my remarks today, I shall be concerned primarily with internal decision-making. However, I can't help remarking that the several groups within the university may be contending for shares in a diminishing amount of institutional self-determination. The net result of categorical grants, political pressure, state-wide coordination,

---

[1]Quoted in The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 10, 1969, pp. 1, 3.

and accreditation may reduce the scope of internal decision-making. At any rate, a fateful struggle for control over our universities is going on today.

Turning now to the internal competition for influence and power, the contenders are five groups: the governing board, the administration, the faculty, the students, and the non-academic staff.

Until fairly recently, formal authority has been largely divided between only two of these groups: the administration and the faculty. The administration has conducted public relations and fund-raising, has handled business management, has made major budgetary decisions, and has made major appointments to administrative posts. The faculty has on the whole made most decisions on the academic program--on curriculum, teaching methods, research program, and degree requirements--and has been closely involved in academic appointments. The governing board has been kept informed and has been regularly consulted but has typically relied on the administration and faculty for most decisions. The formal role of the students and non-academic staff has been minimal. The underlying theory has been that the president in consultation with the board is the responsible decision-maker on all but strictly educational and research questions which are delegated to the faculty, and that other groups may participate as consultants and advisers but do not have final authority or responsibility.

This theory of university governance is being widely questioned and the faculty, students, and non-academic staff are all clamoring for increasing influence or authority over matters previously considered the province of administration, and all are forming councils, senates, or unions to exercise the power they hope to get.

Some of the questions that need answers are these: Should faculty, students, and non-academic staff be limited to the role of advisers or should they be delegated final decision-making power? Should each group be limited to certain areas of decision-making, e.g., faculty to academic issues, students to extracurricular areas, and non-academic staff to working conditions and wages? Or should each group be concerned with all areas of policy and administration? When the views of the various groups diverge, how should the differences be reconciled and policy coordinated? Should each group push for its particular interests or should it purport to speak for the advancement of the institution as a whole? Who represents the public interest as distinct from the institutional interest?

Universities the world over are confronted with these questions. Probably no institution anywhere has achieved a satisfactory solution to the problem of governance which permits all parties to participate equitably and usefully, and yet enables the institution to have a coherent policy in the public interest.

One of the curious aspects of the controversy over governance is that it is couched almost exclusively in terms of rights of individuals and groups, not in terms of the soundness of decisions. The complaints seem to be less that present procedures result in bad decisions than that the individuals affected should by right have a defined role in the decision-making process.

In some ways the current discussion of power in the university proceeds from a false assumption, namely, that some of the groups have not had power or influence in the past. Obviously, all have had substantial power whether or not formal structures for its exercise have existed. A university that has not responded to the needs and wishes of faculty has not been able to retain competent teachers and researchers; a university that has not met the needs and wishes of students has not been able to

attract students or to interest them in its program; a university that has not paid attention to its administrative and non-academic staffs has fallen into deep trouble. And, of course, the power of these groups has grown with the rising mobility of the American people, with the increasing scarcity of qualified faculty and staff, and with the intense competition for gifted students. The idea that the members of an academic community have not had power is utterly false regardless of formal organization.

One can visualize several possible relationships among the several groups. First, they might divide up the areas of decision-making among them, each being responsible for one area, e.g., the faculty for the curriculum, the students for extra-curricular programs, the non-academic staff for working conditions and parking, and the administrative group for whatever is left over. I see little prospect of this kind of tidy division of labor. The concerns of each group are too broad for that. Second, each element might serve as a pressure group advancing its own interests within the university. It takes little imagination to visualize, for example, the students opposing tuition increases needed to finance a rise in faculty salaries. Or one can visualize non-academic staff opposing a building project in order to preserve funds to raise their salaries. The several groups do at present partake of the nature of interest groups, though they are more than that. Third, each of the groups might be concerned with the full range of policy issues, but each would express the particular point of view of its constituency. In other words, each would be a sort of combined policy and pressure group. In my opinion, this is what we are heading toward--a situation in which each group will be eager and feel competent to deal with any subject, but each will approach any issue from the point of view of its particular interest.

It is quite clear that the several groups will not always agree. And so the question remains: Who is to resolve the differences? The umpire, whoever he or they may be, must see the institution as a whole, not only in its internal dimension but also in its relation to the public interest. The role of umpire and coordinator and link with the public falls to the president and his colleagues in the central administration. However, the president and his colleagues are also an interest group who press for the advancement of the entire university. They are therefore not fully qualified to serve the public interest. The function of the governing board--together with such groups as accrediting organizations, Federal agencies, and foundations, and legislatures--is to insure that the public interest is fully represented without, at the same time, encroaching unnecessarily upon institutional autonomy.

I have described the university as though it were a legislature with five houses: governing board, administrative group, faculty, students, and non-academic staff. Is it practically possible in terms of sheer time to debate every issue five times? Will the result of five separate debates produce better answers than one or two? One could argue, I suppose, that the resultant of numerous deliberations by groups with divergent interests and the competing pressure and persuasion of these groups would result in some beneficent outcome. Perhaps something akin to Adam Smith's "invisible hand" or Kenneth Galbraith's "countervailing power" is at work in organizations.

I have considered if the several groups might function more efficiently if all except the governing board were represented in a single council chaired by the president. Through the deliberations of such a body, various points of view could be communicated, differences resolved, and decisions reached which were in the interests of the entire institution. These decisions could then be put to the test of the public interest by review before the governing board. In my opinion, there

is much to be said for a joint council, representing the four inside groups, to be the principal policy-making body of the university. (Such a council would not replace the senates and councils of the various constituent groups but would receive recommendations from these groups.)

One question is whether this council should be advisory to the president or should make final decisions on some or all matters (subject to the approval of the board of regents). In my judgment, the council should be advisory. If the president were not to retain final authority, he could not properly be held responsible for the progress of the institution. That responsibility would then have to be transferred to the council.

It would of course be only a small step from the kind of advisory council I am suggesting to the assumption of authority over the university by such a council. In fact it is often suggested today that the president might become a figurehead serving as chairman of the council and as master of ceremonies while full authority and responsibility would be assumed by the council. Some radicals would merge the council with the governing board, by adding lay citizens to the council, so that there would no longer be a separate organ to represent the public interest.

The council I have suggested would not be attractive to those who look upon faculty as having primacy in the governance of the university--especially those who subscribe to the ancient aphorism that "the faculty is the university." But once students have been admitted to a role of influence, and once non-academic employees have successfully asserted their role, it is hard to make the case that the faculty is more than one of several interest groups.

If you think I am heading toward some solution of the problem of governance, you will be disappointed. I am personally quite uncertain as to what system of governance is in the general public interest, and I believe the broad public interest is what should be served, not privilege for any group, and not even the mere glorification of institutions which are, after all, only servants of society.

I tend to be fairly cautious in my approach. We should be very careful, I think, in disturbing established relationships that have produced a solid--and on the whole free--educational system. I also believe that the lay governing board should be continued. It has proved an effective insulator from improper pressures of politicians and donors, and it serves to represent the public interest in a way that no combination of administrators, faculty, students, or employees could do. I believe that faculty members are professionals who must be relied upon for educational and research decisions. I have already criticized them for being too discipline-oriented and too complacent in the matter of liberal education. Yet, I do not see how any group but faculty members can be entrusted to determine the best ways of teaching Greek literature, or surgery, or nuclear engineering, or music, or to set degree requirements, or to decide what research tasks are important in these fields, or to recommend what equipment is needed or what books ought to be in the library. No lay board, no administrator, and no students are qualified to make these decisions. They must be delegated to the professionals with only broad review and evaluation by others. In carrying out their trust, the professionals would do well, in my opinion, to ensure broad participation among their own numbers in policy matters, they should at times consult their peers outside the university, and they should listen regularly to the opinions of their students. But the decisions must inescapably be theirs.

Other decisions and operations of the university are not quite as specialized and technical. These include business management, fundraising, salary scales, and fringe benefits, internal allocation of operating funds, campus planning, building priorities, parking, student rules, extracurricular life, student housing, and the like. In these areas, everyone is an expert and it is really in these areas that the several groups are clamoring for a larger voice.

My opinion is that faculty, students, and non-academic staff--as well as some outside groups such as parents and alumni--all have something to say on these matters. Moreover, in the interests of good education, I believe students especially should be involved because of the many opportunities for learning in connection with university affairs. Even if students could contribute nothing, as educators we would be obliged to encourage their participation.

However, each of these groups, whether functioning separately or in a joint council, should be advisory--not authoritative. The reasons are: (1) that each is an interest group and seeks its own advantage which may not be consistent with the welfare of the institution as a whole or of society; (2) that each sees the institution from a particular and partial point of view, (3) that the several groups are likely often to disagree, (4) that if they come into agreement through negotiation, coalitions, etc., the result would not necessarily be in the interest of the university or the public. I do not accept the theory of the "invisible hand" or "countervailing power" as applied to organizations. I believe there is need in an institution for a leadership--namely, the president and his associates, working with a lay governing board--which specializes in seeing the institution as a whole and relating it to the public which it serves and from which it derives its support. I do not mean to say that the president and his administrative colleagues are more perceptive, or more honest, or more wise, or more capable than other groups in the university. I am only saying that their interests are more closely identified with the university as a whole, and that by the nature of their work they are sensitive to the social interest. The weakness of faculty, students, and non-academic staff, as holders of institutional power, is that they are and often behave as, interest groups and that they are often insensitive to public responsibility as well as to public relations. This allegation will undoubtedly be challenged and undoubtedly there are exceptions. However, I submit that the claim is essentially correct. It is in no sense a criticism of faculty or students or non-academic staff as people, but only a comment on the implications of their roles in the university.

Having said that power--formal and actual--should reside in the president working in close association with a lay governing board, I hasten to add that any worthy president will arrange for all individuals and groups in the university to express their views, and he will listen to these views. Moreover, he will welcome both formal and informal channels of communication throughout the organization, and will heed the advice received. However, final decisions should be the president's, subject to approval of the governing board, and it should not become a constitutional crisis when the advice of some group is not followed. Courtesy would ordinarily require, however, that the group be informed as to why its advice was not accepted.

What I have said so far presupposes that the various groups in the university will function through discussion and persuasion, not coercion. The new feature of university governance in America is coercion in the form of demonstrations, sit-ins, strikes, publicity campaigns and the like. All three groups--faculty, students, and non-academic employees--have been involved to varying degrees. The universities have been shocked and influenced by these tactics.

The existence of coercion, it seems to me, does not alter, but rather reinforces, my conclusions about governance. If the parties are to make their demands by coercion, it becomes essential that final authority rest with the president and a lay board having responsibility for the whole institution and having special concern for the public interest as distinct from the partial interests of faculty, students, and non-academic staff. The greater the tendency to coercive tactics, the greater should be the authority of the president and board. The institution can afford wide consultation and participation in decision-making when the discussions are conducted in an atmosphere of calm detachment and a sincere desire to reach solutions. The president and board, under these conditions, can delegate responsibility. But when the tactics of coercion are used, and when the game is a struggle for power rather than the solution of problems, the authority must be firmly in the hands of the president and the board or the institution will fly apart. It must be remembered that the tactics of coercion can be employed against any of the various groups, students, faculty, and non-academic staff as well as against the administration.

Having expressed views that are supportive of the present system of governance, I am troubled by the educational conservatism of the academic community. Earlier I mentioned the apparent inability of colleges and universities to be creative in undergraduate liberal education. This seems to me to be a problem which has not been soluble as things now stand. Perhaps it has not been soluble because academic policy is precisely the area most completely under faculty domination, and which is least influenced by administrators, the governing board, or students. But I do not completely absolve administrators of the blame for inaction in educational reform. They have accepted only too readily what I have called the "prestige" theory of higher education, and have aided and abetted the faculty in concentrating on disciplines, on research and scholarship, etc., and have not used all their powers in promoting good education of undergraduates. It is too easy to blame the faculty, or to blame the system of governance which delegates educational decisions to faculty.

A reasonable question on which to conclude is this: Is a change in the system of governance needed in order to overcome the educational conservatism of the university? Can such a change be achieved without setting off a pattern of continuing unrest and violence that would destroy the tranquil atmosphere so essential to scholarship? I think there are important values in the present system of governance, but I think the present system should be an instrument of educational reform. In short, I am calling on administrators and faculty members to do something they have seldom achieved, namely, to undertake basic revision of undergraduate education. I am by no means sure they can successfully meet this challenge. If they do not, the consequences will, I think, be disastrous for higher education.

One of the ironies of contemporary higher education is that we have been through our greatest era of growth and development but have not captured the enthusiasm of our undergraduates. We have employed thousands of faculty, raised salaries and fringe benefits, built buildings, purchased books and equipment, entered new academic fields, and organized new institutions, but we have not devised a form of liberal education that fits the late twentieth century. The tragedy of it all is that we haven't really tried because in our preoccupation with research, scholarship, and institutional prestige we haven't even been aware of our mediocre performance in liberal education. It is past time to get on with this job.